

One of the Pecksniffian arguments at that time was that Zola wrote for his own countrymen, and that even if he were justified in addressing them as he did, there was no excuse for placing translations of his works in the hands of English people, to whom those works did not apply. This was ridiculous, English society being quite as deeply, though by reason of the national hypocrisy, not so openly corrupt as French society. As for the case of Franchise Mouche and the cow, La Ooliche, one might have found, as already stated, numerous instances of young girls being similarly employed in Great Britain. But of course such matters were not to be spoken of or written about! They must be cloaked over, covered up, so that they might continue unhindered! Besides, it was abominable to assert such things. The rural districts of England were moral paradises, safe in the guardianship of parson and squire ! Only London was immoral, poor, wicked London, which bears the weight of many a sin which is not its own. It would be interesting, indeed, to know how far those moral paradises, the rural districts, contribute to the illegitimate births with which London is at times reproached. Is there even a single day in the year when London does not witness the arrival in its midst of some unfortunate country girls who have left their

homes to hide
their shame among the multitude of its
inhabitants ?

But one must return to the trial. When Sir
Edward
Clarke had read a few of his extracts the
demeanour of the
jury and their repeated interruptions plainly
indicated what
their verdict would be. Even then, no doubt,
the better
course would have been to let the trial
proceed, in order
that counsel might have his opportunity of
presenting the
defence, if not for the enlightenment of the
jury, at least